

not disclosed by Candelore. For the reasons stated below, Applicant respectfully requests the Examiner to withdraw the rejections of Claims 1-3, 5-9, 11, 19-20, 22-25, 27, and 29, and to pass these claims to allowance.

Claim 1

Regarding Claim 1, Applicant respectfully submits that Candelore does not disclose a “digital video recorder connectable to a set-top box ... the digital video recorder comprising: at least one recorder interface connectable to the auxiliary interface; a storage device; and an electronic program guide subsystem connected to the recorder interface to receive the electronic program guide information from the set-top box and to process the electronic program guide information to schedule recording the broadcast audiovisual data on the storage device.” At column 2, lines 38-44 and Figure 1, Candelore discloses an apparatus which includes a “program data receiver 110” coupled to “a digital video recorder or player 140.” Candelore further discloses at column 3, lines 47-60 that “[t]he program data receiver 110 includes a digital receiver 210” which includes “a central processing unit (CPU) 212” which “may support a graphical user interface (GUI), such as electronic programming guide (EPG).” Candelore also discloses at column 4, lines 50-52 that “[i]n one embodiment, the program data receiver 110 is a television set where the digital receiver 210 is a set-top box integrated therein.” In this way, Candelore discloses a set-top box including an electronic program guide and which is coupled to a digital video recorder.

In contrast to a set-top box including an electronic program guide as described by Candelore, Claim 1 of the present application is directed to embodiments in which a digital video recorder is connectable to a set-top box and “the digital video recorder compris[es] ... an electronic program guide subsystem connected to the recorder interface to receive the electronic program guide information from the set-top box and to process the electronic program guide information to schedule recording the broadcast audiovisual data on the storage device” (emphasis added). Because Claim 1 discloses features that are not taught, disclosed, or suggested by Candelore, Applicant respectfully submits that Claim 1 is patentably distinguished over Candelore. Applicant respectfully requests the Examiner to withdraw the rejection of Claim 1 and to pass Claim 1 to allowance.

Claims 2-3, 5-9, and 11

Claims 2, 5-6, and 11 depend from Claim 1, so each claim includes all the limitations of Claim 1, and each claim further recites limitations of particular utility in addition to the limitations of Claim 1. Claim 3 depends from Claim 2, and Claims 7-9 depend from Claim 6. Claims 3 and 7-9 each includes all the limitations of Claim 1 and any intervening claims, and each claim further recites limitations of particular utility in addition to the limitations of Claim 1. Therefore, Claims 2-3, 5-9, and 11 are patentably distinguished over Candelore since each claim discloses features that are not taught, disclosed, or suggested by Candelore. Applicant respectfully requests the Examiner to withdraw the rejections of Claims 2-3, 5-9, and 11 and to pass these claims to allowance.

Claim 19-20

Regarding Claim 19, Applicant respectfully submits that Candelore does not disclose an “electronic program guide processing device connectable to a set-top box ... the electronic program guide processing device comprising: at least one device interface connectable to the auxiliary interface; and an electronic program guide subsystem connected to the device interface to receive and process the electronic program guide information from the set-top box.” As described above with respect to Claim 1, Candelore discloses a set-top box including an electronic program guide and which is coupled to a digital video recorder.

In contrast to a set-top box including an electronic program guide as described by Candelore, Claim 19 of the present application is directed to embodiments in which an electronic program guide processing device is connectable to a set-top box and “the electronic program guide processing device compris[es] ... an electronic program guide subsystem connected to the device interface to receive and process the electronic program guide information from the set-top box” (emphasis added). Because Claim 19 discloses features that are not taught, disclosed, or suggested by Candelore, Applicant respectfully submits that Claim 19 is patentably distinguished over Candelore.

Claim 20 depends from Claim 19, so Claim 20 includes all the limitations of Claim 19. Claim 20 further recites limitations of particular utility in addition to the limitations of Claim 19. Therefore, Claim 20 is patentably distinguished over Candelore since it discloses features that are

not taught, disclosed, or suggested by Candelore. Applicant respectfully requests the Examiner to withdraw the rejections of Claims 19 and 20 and to pass these claims to allowance.

Claim 22

Regarding Claim 22, Applicant respectfully submits that Candelore does not disclose “a method for communicating electronic program guide information from a set-top box configured to receive the electronic program guide information to a digital video recorder comprising an electronic program guide subsystem, the method comprising: connecting at least one recorder interface of the digital video recorder to at least one auxiliary interface of the set-top box, the recorder interface connected to the electronic program guide subsystem; recognizing the connection of the digital video recorder to the set-top box; and communicating the electronic program guide information from the set-top box to the electronic program guide subsystem.”

As described above with respect to Claim 1, Candelore discloses a set-top box including an electronic program guide and which is coupled to a digital video recorder. In contrast, Claim 22 of the present application is directed to embodiments in which “the digital video recorder compris[es] an electronic program guide subsystem” and in which the electronic program guide information is communicated “from the set-top box to the electronic program guide subsystem” (emphasis added). Because Claim 22 discloses features that are not taught, disclosed, or suggested by Candelore, Applicant respectfully submits that Claim 22 is patentably distinguished over Candelore. Applicant respectfully requests the Examiner to withdraw the rejection of Claim 22 and to pass Claim 22 to allowance.

Claims 23-25, 27, and 29

Claims 23 and 27 depend from Claim 22, so each claim includes all the limitations of Claim 22, and each claim further recites limitations of particular utility in addition to the limitations of Claim 22. Claims 24-25 depend from Claim 23, and Claim 29 depend from Claim 27. Claims 24-25 each includes all the limitations of Claims 22 and 23, and each claim further recites limitations of particular utility in addition to the limitations of Claims 22 and 23. In addition, Claim 29 includes all the limitations of Claim 27 and further recites limitations of particular utility in addition to the limitations of Claim 27. Therefore, Claims 23-25, 27, and 29 are patentably distinguished over Candelore since each claim discloses features that are not

taught, disclosed, or suggested by Candelore. Applicant respectfully requests the Examiner to withdraw the rejections of Claims 23-25, 27, and 29 and to pass these claims to allowance.

Response to Rejection of Claims 4 and 30 Under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

In the November 21, 2001 Office Action, the Examiner rejects Claims 4 and 30 as being unpatentable over Candelore in view of Ellis, et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,760,821). The Examiner asserts that Candelore teaches essentially the claimed invention except "wherein the electronic program guide subsystem further comprises an electronic program guide storage buffer to store the electronic program guide information." The Examiner further asserts that Ellis teaches localizing a national electronic program guide schedule and that it would have been obvious to modify Candelore as taught by Ellis so that Candelore can store EPG information for later use.

As described above with regard to the rejections of Claims 1 and 22 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e), Candelore does not teach, disclose, or suggest all the limitations of either Claim 1 or Claim 22. Furthermore, Ellis does not teach, disclose, or suggest the limitations of Claims 1 and 22 which are not taught, disclosed, or suggested by Candelore. Therefore, Claims 1 and 22 are patentably distinguished over Candelore in view of Ellis.

Claim 4 depends from Claim 1, so Claim 4 includes all the limitations of Claim 1 and Claim 4 further recites limitations of particular utility in addition to the limitations of Claim 1. Claim 30 depends from Claim 22, so Claim 30 includes all the limitations of Claim 22 and Claim 30 further recites limitations of particular utility in addition to the limitations of Claim 22. Therefore, Claims 4 and 30 are patentably distinguished over Candelore in view of Ellis. Applicant respectfully requests the Examiner to withdraw the rejections of Claims 4 and 30 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) and to pass these claims to allowance.

Response to Rejection of Claims 10, 12, 26, and 28 Under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

In the November 21, 2001 Office Action, the Examiner rejects Claims 10, 12, 26, and 28 as being unpatentable over Candelore in view of Dunn, et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,648,824). With regard to Claims 10 and 26, the Examiner asserts that Candelore teaches essentially the claimed invention except wherein the electronic program guide subsystem is configured to receive updated EPG information from the set-top box, where the set-top box is configured to detect updated EPG information. The Examiner further asserts that Dunn teaches systems and methods for operating an interactive television system with updated EPG information and that it would

have been obvious to modify Candelore as taught by Dunn so that Candelore can update the EPG information.

With regard to Claims 12 and 28, the Examiner asserts that Candelore teaches essentially the claimed invention except wherein the EPG subsystem is configured to transmit a request signal to the set-top box, where the set-top box is configured to selectively transmit the EPG information to the EPG subsystem in response to the request signal. The Examiner further asserts that Dunn teaches wherein a household may request video data to the database server through the set-top box, and that it would have been obvious to modify the EPG system of Candelore as taught by Dunn so that users can request desired programs.

As described above with regard to the rejections of Claims 1 and 22 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e), Candelore does not teach, disclose, or suggest all the limitations of either Claim 1 or Claim 22. Furthermore, Dunn does not teach, disclose, or suggest the limitations of Claims 1 and 22 that are not taught, disclosed, or suggested by Candelore. Therefore, Claims 1 and 22 are patentably distinguished over Candelore in view of Dunn.

Claim 10 depends from Claim 1, and Claim 12 depends from Claim 11 which depends from Claim 1. Therefore, Claims 10 and 12 each includes all the limitations of Claim 1, and each claim further recites limitations of particular utility in addition to the limitations of Claim 1. Claim 26 depends from Claim 22, and Claim 28 depends from Claim 27 which depends from Claim 22. Therefore, Claims 26 and 28 each includes all the limitations of Claim 22 and each further recites limitations of particular utility in addition to the limitations of Claim 22. Therefore, Claims 10, 12, 26, and 28 are patentably distinguished over Candelore in view of Dunn. Applicant respectfully requests the Examiner to withdraw the rejections of Claims 10, 12, 26, and 28 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) and to pass these claims to allowance.

Response to Rejection of Claims 13-18 Under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

In the November 21, 2001 Office Action, the Examiner rejects Claims 13-18 as being unpatentable over Candelore in view of Lownes, et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,137,539). The Examiner asserts that Candelore teaches essentially the claimed invention except for an auxiliary interface or a recorder interface which supports isochronous, asynchronous, or synchronous communication. The Examiner further asserts that Lownes teaches an IEEE-1394 digital

interface which can support such communications and that it would have been obvious to modify Candelore as taught by Lownes so that Candelore can support such communications.

As described above with regard to the rejection of Claim 1 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e), Candelore does not teach, disclose, or suggest all the limitations of Claim 1. Furthermore, Lownes does not teach, disclose, or suggest the limitations of Claims 1 that are not taught, disclosed, or suggested by Candelore. Therefore, Claim 1 is patentably distinguished over Candelore in view of Lownes.

Claims 13-18 each depend from Claim 1, so each claim includes all the limitations of Claim 1, and each claim further recites limitations of particular utility in addition to the limitations of Claim 1. Therefore, Claims 13-18 are patentably distinguished over Candelore in view of Lownes. Applicant respectfully requests the Examiner to withdraw the rejections of Claims 13-18 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) and to pass these claims to allowance.

Response to Rejection of Claim 21 Under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

In the November 21, 2001 Office Action, the Examiner rejects Claim 21 as being unpatentable over Candelore in view of Lawler, et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,699,107). The Examiner asserts that Candelore teaches essentially the claimed invention except wherein the EPG processing device comprises a user viewing monitor that keeps track of and compiles a user viewing history and set of user preferences. The Examiner further asserts that Lawler teaches such an interactive viewing system and that it would have been obvious to modify Candelore as taught by Lawler to provide the desirable advantage of allowing a service provider to track the viewing of users.

As described above with regard to the rejection of Claim 19 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e), Candelore does not teach, disclose, or suggest all the limitations of Claim 19. Furthermore, Lawler does not teach, disclose, or suggest the limitations of Claim 19 that are not taught, disclosed, or suggested by Candelore. Therefore, Claim 19 is patentably distinguished over Candelore in view of Lawler.

Claim 21 depends from Claim 19, so Claim 21 includes all the limitations of Claim 19 and further recites limitations of particular utility in addition to the limitations of Claim 19. Therefore, Claim 21 is patentably distinguished over Candelore in view of Lawler. Applicant